

SECRETDraft    
21 September 1968

25X1

WORKING PAPERBROAD GOALS OF TOD

The original objective of the TOD was to show "how U.S. Intelligence resources are directed against major intelligence requirements" with the purpose of "aid(ing) a more precise analysis of the allocation of resources to intelligence targets." Phase I of the TOD development succeeded in relating a large part of the resources of the four major intelligence programs to geographic and subject targets, and showing how those resources were programmed for Collection, Processing, Production and other intelligence functions.

In Phase II of TOD, expansion and improvement of the data base should further TOD's initial objective and should begin to provide intelligence resource decision-makers with a new and more effective means of ascertaining appropriate resource mixes. Resource allocation decisions which can be assisted through the TOD include:

- Decisions about the level of intelligence effort to be attained and the intelligence capability to be maintained.
- Decisions to obtain appropriate mixes of intelligence activities to accomplish given intelligence missions.

In addition, the identification in relation to TOD of selected U.S. forces (units, activities, installations) which contribute both to intelligence and non-intelligence operations objectives can provide a needed insight into the desirable mixes and interrelationships of intelligence forces and other forces. All of the foregoing are interacting and need to be understood more clearly in order to better identify the costs of performing intelligence missions and to decide how much intelligence effort should be expended in the light of returns reasonably expectable from such effort.

The intelligence resource decision-makers for whom the community-wide TOD is intended are primarily those at the national level and at the top echelons of individual departmental or agency administration. The ultimate users of all intelligence are at the Presidential level, and their requirements establish basic parameters for resource allocations. Intelligence support is essential also for defense policy making and military operations and readiness, and for foreign policy making and the conduct of foreign affairs. However, while the community-wide TOD should in concept and design respond to the needs of the

~~SECRET~~WORKING PAPER

*Defines Table*

foregoing levels of decision making, the evolution of the TOD matrices and the organization of the TOD data base should permit the next levels of resource planners and managers (e.g., the military service secretary, the major intelligence program manager, etc.) to interrelate with the TOD structure and derive benefit from portions of the TOD data base which reflect their managerial responsibilities. Accordingly, a broad goal for the further development of TOD should be to help promote uniformity and commonality in the description of intelligence objectives and in terms used for the measurement of resources. If in the future, it becomes desirable for operation level managers within a department or agency to develop more detailed TOD displays for their own resources, basic compatibility with the community TOD should be maintained. Since intelligence resource management must exist within the larger established frameworks of Congressional appropriations and overall departmental resource allocation and accounting procedures, TOD must accept the additional requirement of synchronizing with those systems.

#### SCOPE CHANGES TO TOD

In Phase II the TOD continues to be a project in a developmental stage. While some continued experimentation is essential in the course of testing and evaluating the TOD structure and data base, it is evident that the TOD will be looked to in the coming year to assist in major intelligence issue analysis and program planning. There will be a continued need to make clear to potential users of the TOD both its capabilities and its limitations at this stage in the development process. As General Carroll recently commented, the TOD appears to have a great potential utility but at present it is a "one-sided device -- it shows cost, but not value." The TOD Committee believes that during Phase II the TOD development should continue to focus on creating a framework for displaying resource information, leaving the question of value to other groups.

Phase II of TOD development will seek to provide a more orderly set of definitions, from the standpoint of a community overview, of the mission orientation of intelligence resources, and tabulations of intelligence "forces" which relate them to missions and targets. Force tables, and financial tables which can be developed therefrom, are particularly useful in connection with the Collection of Positive Intelligence where diverse and costly sensors and equipment are employed (e.g., aircraft, drones, ships, radar systems and/or installations, etc.)

SECRETWORKING PAPER

The TOD Committee will continue to seek for more effective ways to display the interrelationships among intelligence activities and the cost and effectiveness implications of varying sets of resources against targets and to carry out particular missions. In examining these interrelationships, one important question always is whether discrete units and facilities can be presented as making up an "intelligence system" and how best to display the resources of each such system according to standard cost categories (R&D, Investment, Expenses) and according to intelligence functions performed.

Part II of this report pointed out that the TOD Phase I excluded so-called DoD "tactical" intelligence, DoD Program VI intelligence-related R&D resources, and the production resources of the Department of State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. In TOD Phase II, it is proposed that State's INR activities be included, and that DoD Program VI support be included insofar as it is related to intelligence activities otherwise included in the TOD. As to "tactical" intelligence activities not now included in the CIP, the TOD Committee proposes to incorporate in the TOD those which have an important potential to interface with and possibly to affect national intelligence. To test this general criterion, the TOD Committee plans to examine the intelligence staff activities performed for U&S Commands and the major service components of Theatre Commands (e.g., in Europe this would include J-2 USEUCOM, A-2 USAFE, G-2 USAREUR and N-2 NAVFORCENR).

The time horizon of the TOD should be moved out in the direction of the coverage of the Five Year Defense Plan (FYDP) which now projects forces for eight years and costs for five. Phase II of TOD is planned to cover resources and forces for FYs 1969, 1970 and 1971, the latter being the focal year for the program reviews which take place during the spring and summer of calendar 1969. In addition, TOD Phase II, where required, will update information on FY 1968 derived from TOD Phase I, and selectively may develop some force table information beyond FY 1971.

The TOD Phase I succeeded in target-orienting about 50% of the total resources which it identified. The TOD Committee anticipates that the target-oriented portion of its displays in Phase II will be substantially above 50%, resulting in considerable part from the Committee's plan to target-orient the research and development function insofar as it appears meaningful and realistic to do so.

WORKING PAPER

In TOD Phase I only the USSR, Communist China and Cuba were identified as individual targets, all other countries being encompassed in regional groupings. Numerous other countries eventually warrant individual treatment, but all cannot realistically be accommodated in a single TOD cycle in the light of other objectives for the further development of TOD. Accordingly, the TOD Committee presently plans in Phase II to identify separately the additional countries of North Vietnam, North Korea and Thailand. After further consultation with individual program representatives it may appear feasible to include still other individual countries in Phase II.

A number of additional refinements, not specifically described herein, are proposed by the TOD Committee for Phase II. These fall under the general heading of definitional modifications based on experience with Phase I. They relate to clarifications in definitions of targets, cost categories, intelligence sensors, and intelligence functions. In the latter case, the General Support function will be redefined with the result of target-orienting a larger portion of support resources.

DATA CALL SIMPLIFICATION

Although increased data will be obtained in TOD Phase II, the burden on each reporting entity should decrease. Experience with Phase I makes it possible for data call formats to be tailor-made for individual entities, eliminating questions which are inapplicable to a given reporting unit.

ANTICIPATED PROBLEMS

The attempt which the TOD Committee proposes to make during Phase II to progress in the development of realistic and useful mission statements is a difficult conceptual task. The attempt to identify and describe intelligence "systems" is likely to prove even more difficult when it is sought to associate collection systems with processing activities and with intelligence production work. Many interrelated intelligence activities are multipurpose, contributing to more than one mission, with the result that any cost/benefit analysis of such "systems" would be forced to use multiple criteria. These difficulties notwithstanding, the TOD Committee believes that inquiries along these lines are a worthwhile part of such a developmental program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The TOD Committee recommends that Phase II be undertaken for continued exploratory development in general consonance with the goals and scope of work identified herein.

1. Organization:

- a. Identifications & relationships.
- b. Subordinations
- c. Functions
- d. Strengths

3. Activities:

- a. Type
- b. Posture
- c. Status

2. Facilities & Equipment

- a. Location
- b. Descriptions:
  - 1) Size
  - 2) Shape
  - 3) Construction